The Principia.

First Principles in Religion, Morals, Government, and the Economy of Life.

VOL. II.—No 23. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 29, 1861. WHOLE NUMBER 85.

The Principia

Published Weekly, at 339 Pearl Street, (two doors above *Harpers' Buildings*) New-York.

WILLIAM GODDELL, Editor.
SAMUEL WILDE, Proprietor.

TERMS: One Dollar a year, in advance.
Direct business letters, with remittances, to
MELANCTHON R. WILLIAMS, Publishing Agent, as above.

PROSPECTUS.

Our object, by this publication, is to promote pure religion, sound morals Christian reform: the abolition of slaveholding, caste, the rum-traffic, and kindred crimes—the application of Christian principles to all the relations, duties, business arrangements, and aims of life:—to the individual, the family, the Church, the State, the Nation—to the work of converting the world to God, restoring the common brotherhood of man, and rendering Society the type of heaven. Our text book is the Bible; our standard, the Divine law: our expediency, obedience; our plan, the Gospel: our trust, the Divine promises; our panoply, the whole armor of God.

☞ Editors friendly, please copy, or notice.

REVIEW OF THE RESULT OF THE EX-PARTE COUNCIL ON THE CHURCH OF THE PURITANS, IN CONNECTION WITH SOME OF ITS ANTECEDENTS.

We published the *Result* in our last issue, together with the *Reply* of the church. That reply was such as it was appropriate for the church to make, and was sufficient for its ample defence. We do not propose to traverse, to any great extent, the same ground. We wrote the greater part of the present Review, before the Reply of the church appeared; yet, in anticipation of it, we marked out for ourselves a course of comment, designed, not so much as a defence of *that particular church*, as of the great body of the christian abolitionists in this country, who have been under the harrow of similar persecutions, for the last quarter of a century. We designed, in doing this, to expose and rebuke the objects and the animus of those persecutions, for the benefit of the rising generation at home, and for the information of christian abolitionists abroad. The treatment of the Church of the Puritans, we exhibit, as a specimen of the entire series, in a number of particulars.

1. *What the Church of the Puritans is not to be excommunicated for.*

In a Review of these proceedings against the Church of the Puritans, the first thing that strikes our minds as worthy of especial notice, is, the things of which the church is *not* charged, by its accusing minority, nor condemned by the ex-parte council summoned to its aid. It will be refreshing to British christians, and instructive to the future student of our ecclesiastical history, to know, that in these times of general declension and apostacy from the faith and practice of their fathers, the far famed Church of the Puritans stood unimpeached, even by its enemies, in that particular. No theological heresy is imputed to it. Nor is it charged with holding, either that slavery is a Bible institution, or that slaveholding, (that "sum of all villainies," the "vilest oppression that ever saw the sun," [1] the "crime of robbery and man-stealing," [2] the "highest kind of theft," [3] "in every instance wrong, unrighteous, oppressive, a very great and crying sin, there being nothing of the kind equal to it, on the face of the earth," [4] the "most oppressive dominion ever exercised by man over man," [5] "inconsistent with christian character," [6]) is not inherently *sinful*—and therefore by resistless implication, is inherently *innocent, and no bar to christian communion!* Nor are they charged with holding religious fellowship with persons guilty of such wicked practices.

Neither is the church charged with sustaining a Pastor suspected of affinity with these new-fangled heresies, nor is it charged with having dismissed a faithful Pastor, charged with no fault but excessive zeal in contending against them.

The Novatianists of the ancient church, in the second and third centuries, though branded as disturbers and schismatics, were not censured for any departure from the theological beliefs of the Church Catholic, nor for any laxity of morals, but rather for too rigorous an administration of church discipline, against time-servers and apostates.* This fact has always redounded to the honor of the Novatianists, in the eyes of their successors, the Protestants and Puritans of modern times. The same honor belongs now to christian abolitionists in general, and to the Church of the Puritans in particular.

2. *What the members of the Ex-parte Council have not excelled their anathemas against.*

We cannot but notice that the getters up of the ex-parte council, the clerical sympathizers with the minority, who concocted and conducted it, commending their "christian patience and forbearance," the members of the council who came from distant cities to assist in the consummation of the "result," *might* have found churches obnoxious to *such* charges, against whom they *might* have directed their vigilance, expended their energies, and exerted their influence. Churches claiming to be the successors of "the revered Puritans, and identified in the eyes of the public, with the Congregational faith and order," in the high place of our literary metropolis, can approvingly sustain a Pastor, (a Nehemiah Adams, D. D.,) an open defender of slavery, from the Bible, without eliciting any "expression of shame" on the part of the Council, much less any recommendation to churches of the Congregational order, to withdraw their "fellowship from" such a church, until it receded from its position. Excellent anti-slavery men they claim to be, but reserve their anathemas for the supporters of a GEORGE B. CHEEVER, for some alleged irregularity in their mode of sustaining him, while malcontents in the church, and neighboring church members and ministers, (some of their own members included,) were doing all in their power to starve him out, and drive him away. But, as for the church sustaining Rev. Nehemiah Adams, D. D., and the like of him, they have not a word of excommunication, of censure, or remonstrance, or even of admonition!

3. *The charges against the Church of the Puritans.*

We look, next, into this remarkable document, to find out *what were* the charges against the Church of the Puritans on the ground of which this ex-parte council censured them. *Correctly* stated, they are, we apprehend, in substance, these;

1. That some members of the church sought the means for supporting Dr. Cheever, by obtaining aid from christians of the same faith and order in Great Britain.

2. That the church, on learning the facts of the case, and considering them, approved the movement, as the "Result," itself certifies, and enumerates among the charges.

3. It is charged that the pecuniary ability of the *Society*, at that period, was fully adequate to meet its own expenses, to which statement it should have been added, but was not, that the complaining minority, on whose behalf this ex-parte Council was convened, was unwilling to bear its part in meeting these expenses. So that the pecuniary ability of the Society was not available to the church, on account of the indisposition of the complainants.

4. It is charged that the Society by a "special subscription was freed from debt," and therefore had no need of extraneous aid, although the accusers refused to pay their subscriptions.

5. That the funds thus obtained abroad, were put into the hands of those who were in favor of using them for the purposes for which they were given, namely, the support of the faithful abolitionist Pastor, Dr. CHEEVER, instead of incurring the risk of their falling into the hands of his known enemies, who left no stone unturned to get rid of him, some of them, at one time, attempting to remove him from his pulpit and people, without the action of either the Church or Society, by brow-beating him into a resignation of the Pastorate, and asking a letter of dismissal; the same persons, or others cooperating with them, at another time, withholding certificates of election to the office of Trustees, from the friends of Dr Cheever, whom they, themselves, as inspectors of the election, had publicly announced to be duly elected, and, some days afterwards, granting certificates of election to opponents of Dr. Cheever, who notoriously, had not been elected,—nor declared to be,—an act of usurpation and outrage, that had to be restrained by civil process, and reversed and rebuked by the civil authorities; a defeat and a disgrace to them, in no way to be avenged or wiped out, but by the sympathising commendations and endorsement of this ex-parte Council.

6. The charge, unsustained by any evidence before us, that in some way, the donors to these contributions in Great Britain, had been blinded as to the facts of the case. The best commentary upon this absurd charge, is the fact that, after *this* charge and kindred ones, had been industriously circulated in Great Britain, by the minority, the same donors and their friends have more than quadrupled their contributions since, much to the chagrin of the malcontents, and leaving them no consolation, but the sympathy of the ex-parte Council.

7. That the church "has allowed tests to be used in admitting members" in accordance with its own views of what duty and truth required of them—most uncharitably refusing to admit accessions of new members, who, they had reason to believe, were presented for no other purpose than to defeat the cherished objects of the church, by thus changing its membership, and throwing the funds obtained in Great Britain, into the hands of those who had raised a clamor against the solicitation of them, who had fruitlessly labored to prevent the contributing of them, and who were now anxious to get hold of them, for the very purpose of defeating the ends of both the solicitors and donors!

A very grave charge against the Church of the Puritans, truly.

8. That the church "has allowed its officers, members and Committees, to represent that the ring-leaders who have carried forward or abetted these machinations against the Church of the Puritans and its Pastor, are pro-slavery, though it has been repeatedly denied by them" the church thus falling into the unscriptural habit of judging men by their actions, rather than by their professions.

9. "That the church in its public meetings, and in the Reports of its Committees, allowed the minority to be stigmatised as 'schismatics'—covenant breakers and conspirators"—merely because their conduct had, in their sober judgment, proved them to be such.

10. "That the church has repeatedly disregarded its own standing rules"—a charge of which we do not find the evidence furnished.

11. That the church acted in accordance with its own judgment in receiving Mr. T. J. Hall into membership and on deferring the trial of Mr. Abernethy, on account of the absence of the Pastor, whose proceedings and character were implicated in the case, by the defendant in the process of the trial.

12. That the church refused a request of the minority for a mutual council, to decide whether the church should transact its own business, or have it transacted by somebody else,—whether it should retain its church independency, or submit to the government of councils, (a government which, according to Isaac Taylor, and other eminent wri-

1. Wesley. 2. Edwards. 3. Grotius, and Presbyterian church of America in 1794. 4. Hopkins. 5. Madison. 6. Abraham Booth.

*Vide Punchard's History of Congregationalism, and authorites therein cited.

ters, has been surpassed by no other ecclesiastical bodies, in the "spiritual despotisms" they have exercised †,—in particular to decide the specified question whether the Church of the Puritans should retain the services of its dearly beloved and world-honored Pastor, GEORGE B. CHEEVER, or whether it should accept, in his stead, a Pastor after the hearts of the minority, and in accordance with the judgment of the Rev. Dr. Bacon of New Haven and Rev. Dr. J. P. Thompson, of New York,—perchance with the privilege of making a selection, by leave of the minority, of one of those bright illuminaries of the American Zion, for Pastor, if, with the avails of "the British aid Mission," their invaluable services could be secured.

4. *The Result of the ex-parte council: its import and implications.*

The Result is nothing less than a recommendation that the fellowship of the Congregational churches be withdrawn from the Church of the Puritans.

As to the minority, there is no expression of doubt in respect to the christian propriety of *their* course. Nothing but affectionate sympathy with them, and high commendations of them, does the result of the ex-parte Council express.

It was very kind, certainly, in these gentlemen, to volunteer their "advice" to the "churches of the Congregational order," who had never requested them to investigate the matter on their behalf, and report to them their "advice."

Suppose an equal number of equally modest gentlemen, should recommend to "the Churches of the Congregational order" to withdraw fellowship from the Tabernacle Church in New York, of which the Rev. J. P. Thompson D. D., is Pastor, or from the church in New Haven, of which the Rev. Leonard Bacon D. D., is Pastor, what would those Pastors and their churches, think of the transaction?

Suppose Dr. Cheever should have been in sympathy with a minority of Dr. Thompson's or of Dr. Bacon's church, who were trying to get rid of their Pastor, against the wishes of the majority, resorting to such methods as have been described: what would the churches, and what would the community say of Dr. Cheever, if he should afterwards act in an ex-parte Council, (as did Dr. Thompson in this case,) or as an advocate of the minority, (as did Dr. Bacon,) assisting to the adoption and promulgation of such a "Result?"

The Council, very considerately and condescendingly says that its action is "only advisory." Indeed! No physical compulsion will be resorted to, nor fines imposed, or imprisonments inflicted for non-complianc. "The churches of the Congregational order," after this timely assurance, will, we trust, breathe more freely.

Yet, we are concerned and constrained to notice that the churches thus addressed, are still without any assurance that their non-compliance will not be regarded as affording just cause for similar action *against them*. Why not?

"The Council does not, of course, assume to act for the Congregational body." Certainly not. For whom then, does it act, but for itself, and the worthy minority that summoned it?

If the Council acts not for the "Congregational body," nor for "the churches of the Congregational order," what means its domineering tone, its affectation of authority, when it says:

We must not *allow ourselves to be held responsible, any longer for the conduct of a church which rejects our principles, spurns our advice, and refuses to redress the grievances* of brethren whom we honor and love."

Why, gentlemen, who made *you* "responsible for the conduct" of the Church of the Puritans? In other words, who committed its affairs to your supervision? Who gave you authority to control it? Your assumption of "responsibility for its conduct" is an assumption of authority over it, or your words are without meaning. The church "spurns your advice," does it? It refused to constitute you, or some of you, with others, its "mutual council," to decide whether [illegible] the church should transact its own business, or allow you, or a hostile minority, [illegible] on its control or its overthrow, to transact its business for it; and this refusal to be controlled by your unasked advice, you gravely allege as an offence, and no course is left for "*your* churches" (?) but to withdraw fellowship from a church that thus *spurns* your authority.

Near the close of this remarkable document, the Council advises the minority, if they should organize themselves into a separate Church, "to make it a church that shall not only defend the rights of the enslaved, but also the rights of its own members, [such rights we suppose, as this minority had been claiming, and attempting to exercise], "which shall not only vindicate the principle of the essential independency of every individual church, but shall also recognize the other great principle of Congregationalism, the duty of every church to advise with its sister churches, in all matters of common interest, and to give a due respect to their counsels and opinions."

This language, expounded in the light of the facts of the case, and the action of the council on those facts, amounts to just this: Every church is to retain its *essential independency*, but every church is bound to submit to its sister churches, the question whether or no it shall manage its own internal affairs, regulate its own finances, control its own membership, receive whom it approves, and exclude whom it disapproves, according to its own conscientious convictions of duty, subject only to the Great Head of the Church, or whether it shall go counter to its own convictions, by submitting to the decision of a council, on pain of excision from the fellowship of the churches.

The churches of this country have had sufficient experience of this sort of church independency, already; a privilege akin to that of voting on the question of secession in a slave State, under ban of Lynch law or banishment; or like that enjoyed by the French soldiery, when required, on parade, to vote on the question, "Shall Napoleon Bonaparte be first Consul for life?"—"There is to be most perfect freedom in voting," said the Commandant, "but if any soldier votes against General Bonaparte, he will be immediately shot."

5. *Relation of these proceedings to Congregationalism.*

This, you call "Congregationalism"—church independency, do you? Is this the Congregational "church order" that you say the Church of the Puritans has violated? Double honor to the Church of the Puritans, if it be so.

Is this the Church Independency of Doctors Bacon and Thompson, of the N. York *Independent*? The Lord deliver the churches from it, if such be the fact.

We close this topic with a brief, but comprehensive and timely paragraph, from the *American Baptist*, of this city.

"Stripped of all circumlocution, the Congregational ministers in antagonism to the Church of the Puritans, are determined that this church shall not exercise its own proper independence, in the discipline of its members and the management of its own internal affairs. No pretense even, is made, that the church is in any respect heretical or otherwise unsound; its only offences are soliciting funds in England, excluding the members that were laboring for its overthrow, and refusing to censure or expel their pastor at the dictation of others. For this exercise of its independence, it is excluded from the Congregational body. If such interference with matters belonging strictly to the internal affairs of a church is allowed to prevail, Congregationalism may as well fold up its banner, and take another name."

6. *Animus of these proceedings.—Occasion and necessity for them.*

We inquire next, into the *animus* of these remarkable proceedings. We have spoken of the "ostensible charges" against the Church of the Puritans. The *real* offence, in the eyes of the Council, crops out however, in one of those specifications.

The Church of the Puritans and its officers, had "*characterized its sister churches as pro-slavery.*" This was a reproach not to be borne. In the summing up of the ex-parte Council, toward the close of their "Result" this offence is dwelt upon and expanded, as its magnitude required.

"We see," say the Council, "but one course left for the churches. We must withdraw from the church that has virtually withdrawn from us."

This lets out the animus of the ex-parte Council. This reveals the secret of its hostile action. There was a pressing and urgent necessity in the case. The measure must needs be resorted to in self-defence. It had become a "*military necessity*," to borrow a significant phrase of the times.

The reproof resting upon us, must be retorted. The indignity must be avenged. Luther has "virtually" excommunicated the Pope. The Pope must make haste to excommunicate Luther, in due form: otherwise, the ban of the christian world will be *upon* [illegible]

"Master! Thus saying, thou reproachest us also."

The church that thus reproaches us—the church that "spurns our advice, and refuses to redress the grievances of a clique that, when thrown into the minority, like the Confederate slaveholders of the South [illegible] alone" in its attempt to [illegible] the majority, must of necessity be crushed [illegible] of the same kidney, will ourselves be branded at last, after having so long and so successfully [illegible] the Congregational churches, on this vexed question of slavery and abolition.

Whether the charge of being pro-slavery be equivalent to excommunication, we will not stop to inquire, nor whether it should be considered offensive to those who, like Doctors Bacon and Thompson, do not account slaveholding to be sinful. But we cannot doubt that the example and testimony of the Church of the Puritans was felt to be a severe reproof, the sting of which goaded on those gentlemen to the measures embodied in their Result. We have often witnessed the same phenomenon before, and, were we called upon to take part in a consultation on the case, could suggest a better remedy for the disease. Imitation of a godly example, is, we think, a better remedy for the wounded spirits of those who feel reproved, than persecution against those whose example and truthful testimony give inward uneasiness.

7. *Rights of minorities.*

The Council magnifies its championship of the rights of minorities. It intimates that in some way, not explained, the rights of the minority of the Church of the Puritans, had been trampled upon?

What rights?

Was it the right of the minority to control the majority? The right of seventeen men to intimidate and drive off the pastor without asking leave of the church and society, intending to keep them in ignorance of it, making it a matter of murmuring complaint against him that he would not submit to their private dictation, but laid the matter before the church?

Was it their right to withhold certificates of election from Trustees whom they had declared, in open church meeting, to have been duly elected, and then, without the knowledge or leave of the church, to issue certificates of election to others.

Was it their right to be exempt from the civil processes by which they were righteously restrained from getting the control of the church and of its funds into their hands, without asking its leave?

Was it their right to oppose and distract the church, because it approved the measures taken by individual members to obtain aid, which measures the minority did not happen to approve?

Was it their right to harrass, annoy, and so far as in their power, disgrace the church by their disorderly conduct in church meetings, and then, by the aid of an unscrupulous, mobocratic, outside populace, and the caterers to an ungodly anti-abolition press, introduced for the purpose, to throw the blame of the disorder upon the insulted and outraged majority?

Was it their right to attempt the control, by their votes, of a church, with which they persistently refused to worship statedly, a church with which they had no sympathy no fellowship, no desire to coöperate, and from which they had withdrawn their pecuniary support, as a means of coercing it into submission, or of destroying it?

Was it the right of the minority, as in opposition to the majority, to introduce new members into the church for the purpose of getting control of it and its funds, diverting them from the object for which they were contributed, namely, the support of the present pastor, thrusting him out, and introducing a pastor of opposing principles in his stead?

Is it the right of a few wealthy members of a church to assume authority over it, in virtue of their money-power, in withholding their support, and then raise a hue and cry of being "aggrieved," because their poorer, but enterprising and devoted brethren, succeed in getting along with their church matters without them?

When, where, and by whom, were minorities of radical abolitionists in the churches recognized as having such rights? When did they ever claim or attempt to exercise any such rights?

† Vide "Spiritual Despotism" by Isaac Taylor.

Throughout the [illegible] States, for nearly thirty years past, there have been [illegible] many, if not most of the churches, holding the [illegible] views of the majority of the Church of the Puritans, and greatly [illegible] of having pastors for their churches of the [illegible] of Dr. [illegible]. When, where and by whom have the rights or wishes of such minorities been regarded, or thought worth considering? [illegible] in those churches belong to such minorities to-day, and can testify that their church [illegible] are conducted in opposition to their most cherished principles, and without the slightest regard to their feelings or wishes in this respect. Of their consistency or wisdom in remaining in such churches, we say nothing at present.

Some, at least, who were active in the ex-parte Council on the Church of the Puritans, will, we suspect, understand this, and could say if they would, whether they have ever sympathized with such minorities, or assisted to shield them from real, not imaginary, aggressions on their rights, or have asked for them, or have granted to them, the *privilege* even, of having notices of anti-slavery lectures and conventions read from the pulpit, or of having the use of the house for such lecture or convention, or a room in the building, for an anti-slavery prayer meeting, or have favored or have permitted a collection for anti-slavery "free missions," or the "American Missionary Association," along with, or instead of, contributions to the support of the "American Board," in its work of planting slaveholding churches among the Choctaws and Cherokees, or for the support of slaveholding or pro-slavery missionaries to the distant heathen.

Rev. Dr. Leonard Bacon of New Haven, Connecticut, who so zealously acted as the champion of the minority of the Church of the Puritans, on this occasion, might tell us, if he would, what part *he* took in relation to the abolition minorities in the Congregational churches of Connecticut, and Massachusetts, in 1836–7. At that time, the abolition members of those churches were under ban of mob law: The threat of persecution by State laws, suppressing abolition meetings, abolition societies, and the circulation of abolition publications in the Free States, was also impending over them. Was the voice or the pen of Rev. Dr. Bacon then employed in defence of the rights of abolitionists, either as church members or as citizens? At that time, a prayer for the enslaved, either in a church prayer meeting, or in a morning prayer meeting, during anniversary week in New York or Boston, was deemed an offence, to be rebuked by the religious press as impertinent, out of order, and calculated to disturb the harmony of the churches—precisely as is still held and enforced by the conductors of the business men's noon-day prayer meetings, in the Fulton street church, and elsewhere, in New York, where abolition members of churches are still gagged, with the connivance of the principal clergy of the city, and unrebuked, so far as is known to us, or (as we believe,) to the public, by the clerical or lay gentlemen of this city and vicinity who were active in this ex-parte Council.

Dr Bacon may remember something of the measures that were taken by the Congregational Association of Connecticut, in 1836, at its meeting in Norfolk, adapted, designed, and generally proving successful to exclude itinerating lecturers, including the lecturers of the American Anti-slavery Society, (Arthur Tappan being then its President, and Rev. E. R. Tyler, a worthy and pious Congregational minister of Connecticut, being the Society's lecturing agent in that State) from [illegible] Congregational pulpits and meeting houses, through [illegible] the State. Dr Bacon the voluntary advocate of the minority, before the ex-parte Council, can tell if he pleases, whether he is the same Rev Leonard Bacon, then residing in New Haven, who advocated and defended those measures.

In no churches, perhaps, in the non-slaveholding States, have the rights of minorities of abolitionists, been more generally disregarded than in Congregational churches, insomuch that many abolitionists connected with them, have been driven out of them into Methodist Episcopal and other churches or congregations, [illegible] freedom in meetings for social worship and prayer. And now when for almost, if not quite the first time in which a prominent Congregational church, "in the high place of a metropolis," has exhibited the phenomenon of a majority of earnest, actively abolitionists, regarding [illegible] refusing fellowship with slaveholders, and [illegible] a [illegible] Pastor of like principles and character, the [illegible] [illegible] rising in the denomination becomes insupportable, the [illegible] has been called, must be [illegible], the [illegible] must be read out of the denomination! The minority must of course, be sustained. And so the rights of minorities now find advocates.

When Lewis Tappan was persecuted in the Broadway Tabernacle Church of New York, for his active abolitionism, he did indeed find a defender in Mr David Hale, a solitary layman, who was not an abolitionist, an act of great boldness and courage, but we have not learned that that church whose present Pastor is among the champions of the minority of the Church of the Puritans, in the ex-parte Council, has ever repented of the persecution, or that the Pastor who led it on, was ever visited with censure by any body of Congregational pastors and delegates, or has lost caste among his brethren on account of it.

We admit that minorities of abolitionists have been tolerated in the churches, and for a good reason. An anti-abolition pastor was once asked why his church did not "eject the disturbers of their peace." He answered: "It would, in so doing, eject the prayer meeting and the Sabbath school, neither of which could be well spared." Such was the fact, twenty-five years ago, throughout large portions of New England. Yet these minorities have been systematically gagged, brow-beaten, their spirits broken, their influence crippled, by overbearing and wealthy majorities, who have not scrupled to single out obnoxious individuals in the churches for persecution, under some false or frivolous pretexts; not on account of their abolitionism,—Oh no! but in reality, for the purpose, and with the effect, of crushing out active abolitionism, a result that, to a lamentable extent, has been attained.

8. *Shame, mortification, disgust*

An estimate of the disinterestedness and impartiality of the ex-parte Council on the Church of the Puritans, will have been suggested to the reader already, by a consideration of that portion of its Result, which argues the necessity resting on the Congregational churches, to excommunicate the Church of the Puritans because, as is alleged, the Church of the Puritans had virtually excommunicated them The Council, it would seem, by their own showing, were sitting in judgment on their own cause, notwithstanding the pretense that issues between slavery and anti-slavery have had nothing to do with the case. We shall not deny what that argument implies, and what we think time and history will authenticate, that the Council and the churches represented, (if not misrepresented), by it, were quite as really on trial, before the bar of Christendom, as the Church of the Puritans, and under a thousand fold more danger of having a verdict eventually rendered against them, on the page of impartial history. It stood them in hand, to make out as favorable a case for themselves, and as strong a case against their opponents, as they could.

The same is evident from the sense of shame, mortification and disgust, that the Council felt, and have expressed in the paragraph that follows. It was indeed a burden that must needs be thrown off. Listen to them.

"Words cannot adequately express the shame we have felt, that a church calling itself by the name of the revered Puritans, and identified in the eyes of the public with the Congregational faith and order, and claiming to be the especial champion of human rights, should have exhibited, in this high place of the national metropolis, such scenes of disorder, such disregard of the sacred rights of the household of faith, and such wanton violation of the laws which Christ has laid down for the government of his churches.

We have not the slightest doubt that these expressions of shame, mortification and disgust, were sincere. We knew, before hand, that the Church of the Puritans was regarded by some of the members of the Council as a "nuisance," a scandal and disgrace to their Congregational Zion, on the walls of which, the Rev NEHEMIAH ADAMS, D. D., defender of the pro-slavery faith, is a burning and shining light, causing no blush of shame, and calling for no inexpressible words to give it utterance.

Paul knew there were professed Christian brethren who were ashamed of his chain, with which, for the testimony of Christ, he was bound. For more than a quarter of a century we have witnessed the shame that has been felt and expressed by many of those whose brethren in the church, had fallen under the disgrace of having been persecuted and mobbed for their fidelity to the slave. The name of abolitionist, has been and still is, an insupportable reproach, with many who never once feel injured with the imputation of being pro-slavery.

For more than a quarter of a century we have been painfully familiar with cases analogous to the present. We have known a dignified, and widely-respected gentleman, of high standing in a [illegible] Congregational church, who was said to have been so deeply affected with shame and mortification at the thought that two of his [illegible] beloved, both in the flesh and in the Lord, had been molded as abolitionists, that he felt almost desirous of parting with his very respectable family surname to get rid of the disgrace. We know that in many, not to say, in most of "the high places of metropolitan" churches, no disgrace could be more dreaded than that of being mobbed for abolitionism. Pro-slavery mobs have been almost universally denominated "*abolition* mobs," as though abolitionists were themselves the disorderly and guilty instigators and operators of the mobs by which they have been assaulted, while the "gentlemen of property and standing" in and out of the churches, in or out of the ministry whose wicked slanders, and violent appeals to the populace, have roused the mobs, have escaped, not only the condign punishment they deserved, at the hands of the magistrates, but even the censure of their churches. In the same spirit "the scenes of disorder" witnessed in the "Church of the Puritans" have been caricatured, misrepresented, and perverted, by the daily presses in this city, in the interest of the minority so highly commended, and so fraternally embraced by the ex-parte Council.

To finish up the same magnanimous work, to give it sanction, to endorse and perpetuate the slander, to stereotype it for the page of history, Doctors Bacon and Thompson, in charge of two wealthy churches in two influential cities, and having under their joint control, a widely circulated religious paper, in the interest of the Congregational body, step forward to guide the measures, and shape the Result of an ex-parte Council, in the interest of the wrong-doers.

They had no words to express their shame, forsooth, in view of "the disorderly scenes" enacted in church meetings of the Church of the Puritans! Why then, did they not, in the use of, at least, some befitting, if not adequate language, rebuke the instigators, the authors, the enactors of those "disorderly scenes," instead of the innocent victims of them!

"They had no words"—no—none at all, wherewith to censure the seventeen who undertook to control the church by intimidating and brow-beating the pastor into a resignation of the pastorate—nor for those who, as inspectors of election, withheld certificates from those whom they had declared duly elected, giving certificates to others,—no censure for those who, armed with such certificates, insisted upon usurping and exercising the office of trustees, and would not yield, till compelled by the strong arm of the civil law.—no censure for those who, having withdrawn from the support and the worship of the church, still sought to control it by their votes, and by the votes of new members to be introduced for the purpose—no censure for those who, having done all in their power to prevent the church from raising funds to support its chosen pastor, resorted to measures like these for getting possession of those same funds, and perverting them to opposite ends, against the purposes of the donors,—no censure for those who, by encouraging an outside rabble, and the caterers to a venal press to crowd the church meetings, demanding their right to come in by force, succeeded in making those meetings "scenes of disorder" and then trumpeting the disorder, with a coloring to disgrace, not the disorderly persons, but their victims, —no censures for those who demanded a mutual council to try the question, whether the church should retain the pastor of their choice,—no censure for those who [illegible] themselves to [illegible] abolitionism, predicted that their pastor's preaching against slavery, would drive him from Union Square and then attempt to get a mutual council and being foiled in that, summoned the ex-parte Council with the hope and expectation that it would assist in the fulfilment of their prediction!

No! It was for none of these that the ex-parte Council found words of censure. For the enactment of *such* "scenes of disorder" in "a church calling itself by the revered name of

the Puritans, and identified in the eyes of the public. with the Congregational faith and order, in the high place of the national metropolis," they felt and expressed no words of mortification and shame. In all *this*. they saw no "disregard of the sacred rights of the household of faith"—no "wanton violation of the laws which Christ has laid down for the government of his churches"—no ; nothing at all of the kind.

On the contrary, the enactors of all this are spoken of by the Council, in the highest, the most unqualified terms of affection and commendation. Had all the church, pastor included, been as exemplary, as pious, as orderly, as truly the "champions of human rights" and Congregationalism as *these*, there would have been no unutterable emotions of "shame" laboring in vain, for adequate words of expression. The Church of the Puritans would never have been advertised in a religious, a Congregational paper, some time since, as the "nuisance of our Zion," by one of the clerical members of the *ex-parte* Council, nor after having passed his very dignified sentence of condemnation, beforehand, at a distance, would he have needed to take a long journey to deliberate, gravely, upon the merits of the case, in an *ex-parte* Council!

Here, for the present, we must pause. Our space fails. The reader has matter before him for meditation, sufficient for one sitting.

But the most remarkable feature of the *ex-parte* Council's "Result" remains to be distinctly considered, though it could not but be incidentally involved, in the preceding.

"*No issue between slavery and anti-slavery*," says the Council, have been involved, "in the difficulties and grievances that have passed under their review."

In a continuation of our strictures, we intend to give *that* statement a sifting scrutiny, in the course of which, the *past* will be connected more closely with the *present*, and the *general* course of things with this *particular case*.

The Principia.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 29, 1861.

☞ LETTERS on business for the *Principia* should be addressed to M. B. WILLIAMS, the Publisher.

LETTERS for the Editor, whether for his consideration, or for the public, should be addressed to WILLIAM GOODELL.

ORDERS for books or pamphlets may be addressed to either of the above.

But in all cases, the *business* matter should be on a slip of paper separate from suggestions or communications for the Editor—because business papers must be kept on the Publisher's file by themselves. For the same reason, what is designed for the Publisher should be on one slip of paper, and matter designed for the Editor's attention or use should be on another, though all may be put into one envelope, and directed to either.

☞ All letters for us should be carefully directed to 339 Pearl street, *not* to 48 Beekman street, nor to Box 1212, (the *former* address of Wm. Goodell, where some of his letters continue to be sent.) This is the more important now, as the office of our friends, is now removed ; and letters directed there will be liable to be lost.

"CONSISTENCY A JEWEL."

We congratulate the powers that be, at Washington, on the rare virtue of consistency, which is, figuratively and proverbially, a "jewel." Emory, the Secessionist and traitor, who had resigned, has been restored to an honorable position in the Army. How must our brave and glorious privates delight to serve under such an officer! They must experience a feeling akin to that with which the Whigs of the Revolution would have rushed to the leadership of Arnold, just after the execution of Andre. But this is only in keeping with many other kindred achievements. Harvey still flourishes, in spite of his admitted treason ; the Departments are incumbered with known Secession clerks : Ross Winans has been permitted to return to his treacherous and traitorous occupations at Baltimore ; and who knows but the pirates recently captured on board the first privateer may yet be organized into a petted body guard ?

Your friends are already yours : buy your enemies. Is not this a doctrine for the present day?—*Tribune, 20th June.*

Yes! We should think so, Messrs. Editors of the *Tribune*, and a " doctrine" that has advocates nearer home than at Washington.—Who are better friends of the Government than the slaves, the free colored people. the abolitionists, and anti slavery men, of all sorts ? Without these, what chance has the Government for defense against its enemies !—Who are its enemies but the Slave-holders and their confederates ?

"Your friends are already yours, buy your enemies!" Who is more effectively preaching up this doctrine than *the Tribune !* when it insists that the war is not to be a war against slavery ? If not against Slavery it is not against Slaveholders. If not against Slaveholders, nor against Slavery. who or what is it against ? Against nobody ? Against nothing ?

The Tribune. we suppose, would have it a war not against Slaveholders, *as such*, but only against rebels :—not against Slavery, but only against rebellion :—a distinction without either a philosphical or a practical distinction.

A war that is not against the Slaveholders is not a war against the Rebels. A war that is not against Slavery, is not a war against rebellion : and the world will discover the fact, one day.

Extinguish Slavery, and by *that means*, you have extinguished the rebellion. Until Slavery is extinguished the rebellion will *not* be extinguished. It may be temporarily smothered, concealed, in spots by the presence of troops, as in Maryland, but all the more dangerous for the concealment, and ready to spring up again, like a bow of steel, whenever the pressure is removed.

The Tribune dreams of Slaveholders who are not rebels, just as *the Independent* dreams of Slaveholders who do not hold men as property. As well might they talk of inebriates who are not drunkards, or of pilferers, who are not thieves, of knaves who are honest men, of atheists who are Christians.

Every Slaveholder, desirous of remaining such, or of having Slavery left unmolested, is a rebel at heart, and the fact will come out, the first moment the opportunity presents itself. Every Slaveholder who would be disaffected by a national abolition of Slavery, however loudly he may professs loyalty, stands ready to betray his trust, and go over to the enemy, the first opportunity.

But are there no Slaveholders who cling to the Union as the best means of protecting Slavery ? Perhaps there are a few such. But are they exceptions to the previous remark ? They are loyal to the Government, so long as they think the government loyal to Slavery, as were *Pierce* and *Buchanan*, traitors, themselves, both of them, in the very act of being loyal to Slavery,—What kind of loyalty is that of Slaveholders who support traitors because they are traitors ?

"Consistency is a jewel," says *the Tribune*. Aye! But jewels are costly, now-a-days ; and consistency is the most costly of all of them. It costs popularity, reputation, patronage, everything that men prize in this world.

"HOW NOT TO DO IT."

There was a time when our politicians pretended to be puzzled with the problem, "How can we abolish slavery ?" The question now seems to be, "How can we avoid abolishing it ?" To abolish slavery is now the very easiest thing in the world. The difficult thing is, "How to prevent its abolition." The slaves would abolish slavery, if we would only let them, without cost, and give us a high premium, even the price of defending the Capital and the Government, if we would only allow them the privilege. But no! We cannot conclude to let it be done. As for carrying on the war and putting down the rebellion without abolishing slavery, *that* is more than the combined wisdom of the Cabinet and the magnates of military science combined, have yet been able to discover.

We should not greatly wonder if the war should be abruptly terminated, not for want of means, men, and money, but wholly because it cannot be pushed farther without abolishing slavery, and incurring the reproach of abolitionism! The Cincinnati *Gazette*, some time ago, looked that dread alternative in the face, and half hinted that possibly, when worse came to worst, it might have to be done. Recoiling as from a spectre, at the very thought, it lapsed into silence. Of other journals the same might be said. Rauge all the unpleasant alternatives in a row—defeat, dismemberment of the Union, recognition of the new Confederacy, re-construction with slaveholding supremacy, on the one hand, and then put victory, restored union, and abolition of slavery on the other, and which do you think, reader, the Cabinet and the military commanders would prefer ? It is not difficult to say which some of them would *not* adventure. as a choice of evils, to select.

COMPROMISES, AGAIN!

The *N. Y. Tribune* learns that "some of *our friends*" (Republicans ?) "in the Legislature of Connecticut, contemplate discussing, if not adopting, the Corwin Amendment to the Constitution of the United States." The *Tribune* cogently hints that "the subject might as well be postponed for the present." It is best to defend the Capital first. Besides, Massachusetts and Kansas have rejected it, and New York has refused to act upon it, so that (since its adoption requires all the free States), it would be a waste of labor to spend any thought upon it, at Hartford. "One thing at a time."

Is this all the *Tribune* has to say against the proposal, in Connecticut, to perpetuate slavery, by an amendment of the Constitution ? Not long since, the *Tribune* noticed a prediction that the President would recommend such a measure, accompanied with the remark that "the fools are not all dead yet." To which we responded, " We shall be glad to find that the folly is confined to the prognosticators." Our apprehensions, it seems, were not unfounded. In proportion as the danger of that compromise increases we shall expect to see the *Tribune's* opposition to it, diminishing. In fact, it has never yet, to our knowledge, declared itself, squarely against it. When the *Tribune* cries out "No Compromise," it means, *no compromise with rebellion*.

A WAR, NOT AGAINST ITS PRIME CAUSE!

"*Slavery, the prime cause of all our troubles*, may embarrass us, unless its relations to the struggle are precisely defined, and scrupulously regarded. *This war is not waged either to overthrow or to protect slavery ;* either to excite servile insurrections in the Rebel States or to suppress insurrections should they occur ; either to entice negroes to escape from their masters or to return them should they take it into their heads to run off with their own heels. It is the uprising of loyal citizens, en masse, for the maintenance of the Federal Union and the supremacy of the Federal laws in all the States, and not for the enforcement of the peculiar local polity of any single State or class of States. In fine, so far as Slavery is concerned, it is a war of *non-intervention*."—*N. Y. Tribune*, May 26.

So this expensive, devastating, and probably, bloody and sanguinary war has been " waged," and is to be prosecuted, "neither to overthrow nor to protect," the prime cause of all our troubles !"

And this is to be regarded wise policy, is it? The wisdom, if there be any, must be "the wisdom of this world," which "is foolishness with God." And as surely as God governs the world, he will yet make its foolishness to appear.

Only think of it! "A war of *non-intervention*" with "the prime cause of the war!" Sensible—very!

THE POLICY OF GEN. CADWALLADER.—Baltimore papers and correspondence, which exult in the fact that Gen. Banks is resolved to continue the "*conciliatory*" policy of Gen. Cadwallader, also furnish us with clear and unmistakable evidence of the mischievous effects of that policy. The secession sentiment in Baltimore is represented to be greatly in the ascendant. It includes three-fourths of the wealthy and middle classes ; and so daring have its demonstrations become, that the exhibition of Union emblems, and the declaration of Union sentiments, are no longer safe. The press is noisy in its seditious assaults upon the Federal Government, and the expressions of sympathy with the rebels, Marshal Kane flaunts about the streets his hostility to the Government, and his defiance of the troops. Such is the fruit of conciliation. If it be persisted in, we shall have a repetition of the horrors of April 17 ; and for the blood that shall be shed, those who have held the reins of authority with so much laxity will be held responsible.—*N. Y Times.*

"The conciliatory policy of Gen. Cadwallader," mischievous as it is, is substantially the policy of President Lincoln, of the Cabinet and of the Camp, generally. the policy lauded by *The Times, The Tribune*. and all the political journals. It is the policy of trying to put down the *rebellion* without abolishing *slavery*. This it is, and nothing else that necessitates the conciliatory policy of Gen. Cadwallader. The latter is but the natural outgrowth, the logical sequence, the inevitable result of the former. A national abolition of the lordly caste of American Slaveholders would cure it. Nothing else will or can. While slavery is recognized, a slaveholding aristocracy is recognized, and that is equivalent in effect (however unintes-

tional) to a recognition of the Southern Confederacy. Jeff. Davis and all.

"A SHORT WAR."—The *Tribune* is clamorous for a short war, and equally clamorous against the only feasible measure for making the war short—the only possible measure for restoring a real peace, either speedily, or at any future period; namely, the abolition of SLAVERY, which is the sole cause of the war, the only obstacle in the way of immediate and permanent peace.

ENCOURAGEMENT.—A subscriber in ——, Iowa, sends us a remittance of Eight Dollars for as many subscribers in his locality, and says. "We are in the habit of saying that many a single article is worth the whole subscription. That one, 'The wisdom of this world is foolishness with God,' was most certainly so."

DR. HODGE ON THE CHURCH OF THE PURITANS, AND THE EX-PARTE COUNCIL.—"IS SAUL AMONG THE PROPHETS?"

For the Principia.

MR. EDITOR: In studying the first Epistle to the Corinthians, I came across the following, in the commentary of Dr. Hodge on the 2d verse of the 5th chapter, relating to the man who married his step-mother. Dr. Hodge says, "It is a right inherent in every society, and necessary for its existence, to judge of the qualification of its own members, to receive those whom it judges worthy, and to excinde the unworthy. This right is here clearly recognized as belonging *to the church*. It is also clear from this passage that this right belongs to each *particular* church or congregation."

Now, this is good doctrine, and from an highly respectable, as well as conservative source. But, if this be true, then, wherein did the "Church of the Puritans" do wrong when it refused to admit to its membership certain persons respecting whom it was abundantly satisfied that their chief, if not their only motive and aim in seeking to be so admitted, was to revolutionize the character of the church, to drive away its pastor, and thus peril its existence; and, who when interrogated on these points, distinctly refused to deny that such were their objects, and that their votes and conduct would be directed to that end?

Is it not a little curious, thus to find extremes meeting, and Dr. Hodge (unwittingly it is true), becoming the *defender* of the "Church of the Puritans," and the *reprover* of the "*Ex-parte* Council."

"*Lux en Tenebris.*"

SOUTHERN SPECULATIONS.—At a recent examination of a class of lads in one of our leading institutions in this city, the meaning of the word "Speculate" came under consideration. Various definitions were given, when a very bright little fellow, who was born and bred at the South, started up with, "*Speculate? Why that means to buy and sell negroes.*"

W. E. W.

F. F. V's OF VIRGINIA.—A member of the seventy first regiment, now on furlough in this city, says: That when the cavalry captured at Alexandria, was brought in, and they were told to treat them kindly, to show their good will, they brought them copies of the latest daily papers. The Virginians examined them with some curiosity, but turned them over as if they did not know exactly what to do with them, and finally confessed *that they could not read*, and this was found to be the fact as to more than half the party.

W. E. W.

PETITIONS TO CONGRESS.

In our last issue, we presented a form of petition to Congress for a national abolition of Slavery, embodying a condensed argument in favor of the measure. For promiscuous circulation, a shorter form may be convenient. For this use, a friend has furnished us with the following

FORM OF PETITION.

To the Hon. the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

The undersigned, loyal citizens of the United States, lamenting in common with many others the evils of civil war, respectfully petition your honorable bodies to take such immediate measures for the entire removal of the cause of this war, being, in our view, the permitted continuance of slavery—as the wisdom and Patriotism of your Honorable Bodies may devise.

News of the Day.

FRIDAY 21st.

British Parliament.—The steamship Africa, which left Liverpool on the 8th inst., and Queenstown on the 9th, arrived here yesterday. In the British Parliament, Mr. Gregory's motion to recognize the Southern Confederacy had been postponed *sine die*.

SATURDAY, 22d.

Negotiation with the Rebels!—The *World* publishes, from "an occasional correspondent," the following letter:

WASHINGTON, June 21.

For some days past ill-omened rumors have flitted through the semi-official circles of this city, which have found their echo in the editorials of *The World* and its contemporaries. Rumors that affect the public very seriously and which gave promise to breed trouble in the cabinet, trouble in the camp, trouble in the city and trouble everywhere—mysterious whisperings concerning great events yet shadowed by the wing of coming time have made all men shudder, from the President in his office, to the greasiest mechanic in Massachusetts. We have heard that the Secretary of State was cunningly devising a plan of compromise by which the present inharmony might ride into place and power; but we could not credit it. In fact, we heard such stories concerning him in whose integrity we had hitherto trusted, and in whose firm, unyielding patriotism we placed reliance, as to make us shrink from the next comer, lest he should bring word of treason, and perhaps worse, dishonor.

We have been appreciated the sacrifice to the country to know if such things could really be, and it was because we respected so thoroughly the integrity of our government that we have declined thus far to send on the rumors. I am enabled, however, to-day to give you, somewhat in detail, the fact concerning one of the most remarkable, and yet most natural events of the age. I do not send them unadvisedly, but only after patient investigation and mature consideration. The source of my information cannot be made public, it is sent privately, for the satisfaction of the editor of *The World*: but the people may rest assured that truth is the corner-stone of this dispatch.

I well know that the readers of *The World* will believe that

THE REBELS ARE FRIGHTENED,

and that they are most anxious to make terms with the parent government, and I am fully prepared for their astonishment when they read that their commissioners

ARE IN WASHINGTON.

It seems that Jefferson Davis having become thoroughly frightened, has, in a semi-official manner, made overtures to our government. When his commissioners reached the capital they were desired to state their case, and to tell what they wished. They submitted two propositions:

First, That the United States unconditionally recognize the existence of the Southern Confederacy, and that the latter be permitted for a term of one, two, or three years, to carry on their government as an experiment. That the expenses of the war, thus far incurred, be equitably arranged between the two sections, and that each do its best for the maintenance of friendly feeling and intercourse between the two peoples. And that if, at the expiration of the time agreed upon, it be found that the experiment cannot succeed, a commission be appointed to reconstruct a union.

This proposition was

PEREMPTORILY REJECTED.

Whereupon they modestly put forth another, as follows:

Second, The South will be content if the government will pledge itself to pass, at the coming session of Congress, an irrepealable constitutional provision recognizing and legalising forever the institution of slavery below

THIRTY-SIX THIRTY,

which is the southern boundary line of the State of Missouri. This done, the provisional government pledges itself instantly to abandon the war, and to reestablish peace and the most cordial relationship, so far as the section is concerned to re-direct the course of trade into its accustomed channels, and in every way restore the happy days of our forefathers.

As to the reception which this proposition received, my informant was positive, though from another source I gather a doubt. He states that it also, was peremptorily rejected. It seemed to the party of the second part a mere intensification of the Crittenden amendment, and not varying greatly from the Adams proposition. Others say that the acceptance of this proposition would not be unacceptable to the Secretary of State, and, therefore, will meet with favor from the President. Between the two I cannot decide.

Mr Davis says that his retreat from *Harper's Ferry* was a stroke of peaceful policy. He had troops enough there to withstand any force which General Scott was prepared to bring against him, and it was not because he feared the result of an engagement at that time, but because he knew that he had no force with which to meet what might subsequently be sent against him. The secession government now rests on a hope—that hope once swallowed up in a disastrous defeat upon the battle field would prove the destruction of what it now sustains. He is sensible of the fact, that if once defeated, there would rise such a tide of popular indignation against him and his co-workers that they could in no way withstand, and ignominious flight or ignominious death would be the lot of one and all.

The N. Y. Sun of Saturday has the following. "*Peace Movements.*—That there are traitors in our midst preparing a masked battery" we all know; we know their organs, their objects, and their devices, well. Their journals, while professing a love for the Union, are studiously promoting the cause of disunion, by the most sinister means. To encourage the south in its rebellion, such letters as the following are being written in the Baltimore *Sun*, are issued by the treasonable clique of operators in New York

The "peace movement" is making rapid headway among the "solid men" of the city. The time has not come yet for speaking out in entire freedom in regard to details, but it may be said without any impropriety, that it has the sanction of many of the leading merchants, capitalists, bankers, and clergymen of New York. It will in due time manifest itself definitely, first, at a monster meeting in the open air up town—and second, in a memorial to Congress at the very commencement of the session.

The only "peace movement" in this city is the rapid dispatch of well equipped regiments to sustain the Union and the laws, and to crush out, at the point of the bayonet, "secretary" conspirators open their fire in this city, and the people will silence it, and dispose of the gunners without waiting for orders from Washington.

"*Schemes of Compromise—Mischief making of Mr. Crittenden.*"—Under this head the *N. Y. Times* of this morning forewarns the Northern public that Mr. Crittenden, if re elected, is to be in his seat, again, at the extra session of Congress approaching, to renew his pro-slavery compromises. *The Times* says:

These compromise resolutions of Mr Crittenden were nothing else than the platform concocted by Wise, Davis, Yancey, Keitt & Co., for the Democratic party, and which that party so slouched as it was, had the good sense to reject at Charleston, in April of last year. It was the insulting demand that Congress should depart from the usage of seventy years, and in contempt of all parties North of Mason's and Dixon's line, establish a Slave-code for the territories.

* * * Secession would soon have broken down, but for the accession of North Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia; and that the preposterous propositions of Mr. Crittenden caused these States to rise in their demands to the point of rebellion, scarcely short of open attack. The "Crittenden Compromise" and the secession of these States stand to each other in the inseparable relations of cause and effect; and upon him rests the responsibility of the civil war that now rages in Virginia.

We fear there is little hope of the defeat of Mr. Crittenden by the more open ally of treason who opposes him; but, at any rate, the country should be warned in time against the perils into which his weak, though possibly well-meant, counsels must lead.

It will be seen that *The Times* wisely prefers the re-election of an avowed Secessionist to a bogus Union man like Mr. Crittenden. It should be understood that a *slaveholder*, is, *prima facia*, a Secessionist, except on condition that the government itself shall remain the tool of *slavery*. The country, if "warned in time," must rise up, and demand of our Government, a national abolition of slavery.

Mr. Crittenden's Election."—*More Masked Batteries.*"—*The Evening Post*, says:

Our armies have twice, within the course of a few weeks, suffered severely from the ambuscades which the enemy has prepared for them, and into which they have incautiously entered. But a more treacherous trap than that at Great Bethel or at Vienna has been devised for us, and is even now being silently equipped and manned. We refer to those schemes of compromise with the secessionists which are to be sprung upon Congress at the special session in July.

Mr. Crittenden, who has just been elected from Kentucky, announces his determination to make some motion for bringing the war to an end. He will be sustained by other southern members, and by some, we fear, from the northern states. Already, a convention of editors is called in this State, to agree upon a plan, it is said, for bringing popular opinion up to the designs of the leaders, and not a few hints are given in the private circulars, to the effect that the war has gone far enough. A part of the scheme embraces the capitalists of the cities, who are to be persuaded not to lend their money to the government for the prosecution of hostilities, or to lend it only at such rates of interest as will discourage the government in its attempts to maintain the federal ascendancy

This scheme is nothing more than a masked battery of Jefferson Davis. He has been thoroughly disappointed in his projects. Supposing that a large party at the North would side with him in his infamous designs, he really persuaded himself that it would be an easy thing to march an

to Washington, seize the public [illegible] archives, and inaugurate a new administration. But the noble and unanimous uprising of the free States put an end to his vain and ridiculous hopes. * * * Davis is in a hopeless predicament. A grand success in battle might impart some degree of vitality to his [illegible] for a short time, but the end is as certain as the setting of the sun to-night. He and his followers must be scattered like chaff before the wind, if not this summer, then in the autumn. He perceives his dilemma, and adroitly contrives a way of escape. It is to divide the North by a well-planned stratagem. Knowing the love of peace which pervades the hearts of northern men, he hopes, by throwing into Congress some scheme of compromise, to divert attention from the vigorous prosecution of the war, and in the end to raise a party of peace even in the midst of our camps.

Beauregard's Threatening Attitude.—The Washington *Star* says: "We have information that General Beauregard is really advancing the main body of his force from his base line at Manassas Junction toward the Potomac. He has certainly considerably increased his different corps east and north of the Junction, now having a considerable force between Occoquan and Fairfax Station and other sections, dotted about in greater numbers from Vienna back to the Junction, in such positions as induce the belief that he is seeking an opportunity to concentrate for a sudden attack upon any point of General McDowell's line he may possibly find comparatively weak and exposed."—*Post* Saturday.

MONDAY 24th.

Military Matters.—Some correspondents represent the Rebel troops as advancing toward Washington, others as about retreating to Richmond. Perhaps they are awaiting the results of negotiations in Washington. All eyes are now turned to the Government, to see whether it will stand firm or no.

Secretary Seward.—In copying from the *World*, as "*Astounding Developments*" the statement the Commissioners of Jeff. Davis are actually in Washington, proposing terms to the Government, the *N. Y. Sun* says:

It is added, however, and we fear it is not altogether without truth, that the Secretary of State, the weak stick of the Cabinet, is disposed to favor the proposition.

Military Compromise.—Neutrality of Kentucky Recognized.—Louisville, June 23.

The morning papers contain a letter from Gen. Buckner to Gov. Magoffin, giving the particulars of an agreement with Gen. McClellan. The agreement is all follows:

"The Kentucky authorities will protect the United States property in the State; will enforce the laws of the United States according to the interpretation of the United States Courts, and will enforce all obligations of neutrality as against the Southern States. Gen. McClellan agrees to respect the territory of Kentucky, even though Southern armies occupy it; but in such a case he will call on the Kentucky authorities to remove the Southern forces, and should Kentucky fail to do this, he claims the same right of occupation as given to the South: also, that if Kentucky should be unable to remove the Southern forces, she will call to her aid the Government troops, and if successful in removing them, then Gen. McClellan agrees to withdraw."

If the Administration adopts a different policy, Kentucky is to be given timely notice of the fact, and if Kentucky changes her determination, a like notice is to be given.

General Buckner had given Governor Harris, of Tennessee, notice of this agreement, and Governor Harris, in reply, gave the assurance that the territory of Kentucky would be respected until occupied by the Federal troops. General Harris also gave peremptory orders to the Tennessee officers to this effect.

Did the Government authorize Gen. *McClellan* to make this arrangement? If the General has this "war-power" to make treaties with Gov. McGoffin recognizing the neutrality of Kentucky, has he not power to call on the loyal inhabitants of Kentucky, irrespective of color or condition, to help sustain the Government? Why should he not do it, instead of virtually releasing the citizens from their Federal allegiance, which is incompatible with neutrality?

Harper's Ferry we are again told is *about to be* occupied by Col. Stone or Gen. Patterson. The old story—rather stale

Fermentation in Baltimore.—This city, quiet on the surface is profoundly agitated in its depths, and is only held in check by the peril of an insurrection. With the very first demonstration of an outbreak, Major-General Banks will, without doubt, shell the city from fort McHenry. He is the man to obey his orders to the very letter.—*Cor. Trib.*

"*An Insurrection?*" Of Rebels, or of Slaves? Which did the writer mean? No matter. The remedy, in either case, is National Abolition.

Setting up for Herself once more.—South Carolina has reverted to her free and independent sovereign condition. A despatch from Washington says:

Governor Pickens has issued a proclamation forbidding any more South Carolina troops from leaving Palmetto-dom. He expresses the belief that the Northern horde contemplate an invasion of the sacred soil of South Carolina, via Charleston, and says that the first duty of South Carolinians is to the State.

Having got the Virginians into the midst of the fire, South Carolina withdraws as she has according to the Confederate theory, an unquestionable right to do. The State is sovereign; her first duty is to herself, and whenever her Governor sees fit, he may recall her forces. Gov. Pickens's act is an admirable comment on the nature of the Confederate bond.—*Post.*

WASHINGTON, June 22.—A gentleman from Paris says that while in that city he saw a letter from Senator Mason of Virginia, dated on the 20th of February, in which he declared that arrangements had been made to ensure the passage of an ordinance of secession in Virginia, and that Washington would be seized at an early day. Mason was then sitting in the Senate.—*Post.*

Runaway "Property."—The Washington *Republican* says:

"In front of our lines, across the Potomac from this city, the number of slaves who run away is not so great as the number of those whose masters run away, or whose masters tell their slaves to shift for themselves. The article has ceased to have a market price, and can hardly be so managed as to produce an income. Virginians who can move South with their slave property are doing so in large numbers, but the number of Virginia slaveholders who cannot move South is still larger. This latter class cannot now sell slaves at the South, where there is neither demand or means of payment, and, as our armies advance, these slaves will run away, or be abandoned by their masters. The thing is inevitable."

What does he Mean?—Senator Johnson of Tennessee, in a recent speech at Cincinnati, expressed his gratification with the assurances that had been given to him by speakers at the reception meeting, "that the "citizens of the loyal States had no disposition to make war upon the *peculiar institution of the South.*" In another speech at Washington, he declared that the people of East Tennessee were loyal to the Union, and though their "enemics" (the Confederates) should "drench the land in blood, they *never could make East Tennessee a land of slaves.*"

WASHINGTON, June 25.—The *National Republican* of this morning states that the release of Ross Winans and the appointment of Emory to a lieutenant-colonelcy in the army were measures that were strongly advised by General Scott.—*Post.*

[Is it so?]

General Scott has been remonstrated with, by western men for ordering the retreat of Cadwallader over the Potomac. The old hero replied: "It's all right—all right; you will say so, three months hence."

More Fugitives Returned!—Col. Burnside of the Rhode Island Regiment, it is said, returned two free negroes to the jailor at Frederick, as fugitives.

"*Free*" negroes! Only think of it. Why should they not, by the same rule, return fugitive whites?

Gen. Prentiss has returned two fugitive slaves, from Ballard County, Kentucky, on the ground that "Kentucky, being still in the Union, were to receive the benefit of the laws of the United States.

The *Tribune on Compromise.*—The Tribune of Monday is out against Mr. Crittenden's Compromise, which proposes to "surrender to slavery all territory south of 36° 30' on penalty of having the sword of now neutral Kentucky cast into the scale of Disunion." The Tribune fears the "Democratic wire-workers" will favor the scheme. But what of Republican wire-workers? Is there the Democratic wire-worker more to be feared than Wm. H. Seward? Can the country be certified that the Tribune will itself oppose the far more dangerous and fatal compromise, renewedly proposed, it is said, by the Commissioners of Jeff. Davis at Washington, for an unamendable amendment of the Federal Constitution, perpetuating slavery forever under protection of the Federal Government? A measure virtually and effectually giving up to slavery, all *North*, as well as *South* of 36° 30'!

FORT MONROE.—A [illegible], it is said, has [illegible] across the water from Fort Monroe into the magazine at Sewell's Point, and that the position of the Rebel [illegible] has been, in consequence, [illegible] or removed.

TUESDAY 25th.

PRO SLAVERY OUTRAGE.—"A large rebel force is reported to be stationed at Martinsburg, where they have caused the most wholesale destruction of the property of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad. Forty-eight locomotives and a large number of cars were surrounded with piles of wood and burned. A large [illegible] was with difficulty saved from the conflagration.

This may be put down as another item in the expense of our national toleration of slavery in Maryland. Make Maryland a free State, all these outrages will cease.

SECESSIONISTS IN GOVERNMENT EMPLOY.—The *Sun* states that a gentleman just returned from Washington, was informed that there were more than thirty secessionists in the Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Chase, and that he dare not turn them out, for fear they would do damage." adding, that eight attempts had already been made to burn the hospital. The *Sun* adds:

And are we to believe that such childish cowardice rules in the departments of Government at Washington?

Rebel Clerks in the War and Treasury Departments.—We are assured on excellent authority that the brother-in-law of Jeff. Davis still holds an $1,800 clerkship in the War Department. His son is in the rebel army, and frequently visits and corresponds with his father. The work of purifying the Treasury Department is slow to begin. Members of Congress who have a claim on some share of its patronage complain that the places, which their loyal friends should occupy, are still filled by traitors. The uniform answer of Mr. Harrington to all applications from them is that he is afraid of deranging the accounts by making too frequent changes. Hence he makes none. Secretary Chase it is difficult to reach.—*Cor. Tribune.*

Neutrality of France.—The French Emperor has issued a Proclamation of neutrality in respect to the civil war in the United States. It is very similar to that of England. It speaks of "the States that propose to form a separate Confederation;" also of "the two belligerent parties." It forbids the subjects of France to enlist on either side, and forbids prizes from either party to be carried into French ports.

Dangers Ahead.—Our military correspondent, who writes from the most advanced portion of our troops at Arlington Heights, sets forth some strong grounds for apprehending a serious disaster in that quarter. It seems to be pretty well established that the rebels are able to throw at least 50,000 men upon our troops, upon the other side of the Potomac, within twenty-four hours, while our whole force beyond the Potomac consists of thirteen regiments only of 800 men each; but little over 10,000 in all. This disparity of force is certainly alarming. It is true, there are something like 30,000 American troops on this side the Potomac, in the neighborhood of Washington; but it would not be easy to throw all these across the river in time to prevent a defeat, even if the safety of Washington would permit their withdrawal. A considerable time would necessarily be consumed in crossing so wide a river by the means at command of our troops.

Everything favors the belief that the rebels intend to strike a sudden blow at some point of our lines. They are not at all likely to await the tightening of the coils by which we intend to strangle them. Their safety consists in breaking the coil, rather than in resisting its strength. They have able Generals, vigorous and energetic in action, as well as skillful in their plans; and it is the height of absurdity to suppose that they will stand by as idle spectators until all the elaborate and complicated arrangements of Gen. Scott are ripe for execution. They will make a dash at some point of our extended lines, in the hope to inspire new courage in their own troops by inflicting a signal defeat upon ours.

It is stated, on good authority, that the rebels have 30,000 troops at the Junction already, that this number is constantly swelled by the daily arrival of regiments from Richmond, and that Gen. Johnson is marching to join them with the 10,000 which he took from Harper's Ferry. The approach of such a force may well incite our government to seek the most prompt and effective measures to meet the [illegible]. It is certainly of the utmost importance that we should not be so entirely absorbed in our own plans as to overlook those of the enemy.—*Times, 25th*

The Traitors at Frederick.—The telegraph has announced the arrival at Monnocacy Junction, three miles from Frederick, Md., of a regiment of United States troops. The boldness with which the Maryland Legislature, now sitting at Frederick, have concocted and passed acts of treasonable legislation sufficiently indicates how the active strength of Maryland Secessionists is increasing as the desperation of their cause is made more apparent by the ill success and retreats of the rebels in Virginia. One branch, if not both, has passed, in violation of the State Constitution, an *ex post facto* bill designed to shield the Baltimore rioters from the punishment due them for their treasonable acts on the 19th of April; another to acknowledge the independence of the Southern Confederacy; and a third denouncing the United States for its "invasion" of Maryland. It is evident that neither the force of public opinion nor the Home Guards of Frederick are strong enough to hold in check a treasonable uprising in that city which should be made as a part of a preconcerted movement in all portions of the State. [illegible] troops have not arrived a moment too soon.—*T*[illegible]

When will *the Tribune* the public, and the Government, learn that the "*traitors*" of Maryland are the *slaveholders* of Maryland, and quell them by breaking up the oligarchy that enthrones them over their fellow-citizens?

A serious riot has occurred in Milwaukie.—The banks of the city on Saturday, threw out the bills of a number of the State banks. This action was resented by a mob, who broke into a

number of the banking offices, and destroyed the books and threw the furniture into the street. The military were called out, and the rioters fled. About fifty were arrested and lodged in jail. The mob afterwards assembled in a [illegible] part of the city and threatened to attack the jail [illegible] their comrades were released. Martial law was proclaimed, and the Governor telegraphed to other points in the State for additional military [illegible] —*World.*

The new Treaty in Kentucky.—Gen. McClellan's treaty of alliance and immunity with Magoffin, will, it is said on good authority, be promptly repudiated by the President, as it is an administrative and not a military measure. We have no doubt the statement is correct.—*Tribune.*

Imbecility. We once again call attention to the strictures of our Washington correspondent upon the course of public affairs. He states that the reason why Harper's Ferry was not occupied by the national troops a week ago is that the General commanding there is imbecile or traitorous and failed to obey the orders of Gen. Scott. Notwithstanding this, no investigation has been ordered nor any reprimand administered, any more than in the case of the blunders and the slaughter at Great Bethel and Vienna. But the most startling point of our correspondent's letter is the statement that *no vigorous military movement is intended* by the Administration, or, to speak more exactly, by the Cabinet. The war is to be dragged along until the people, weary of armies without action, and taxes without triumphs, *can be brought to consent to some compromise like that of Mr Crittenden.* If this purpose or anything approaching it, is really entertained by the Cabinet, or by any members of it, we warn those gentlemen that they cannot much longer remain in the service of the United States. Indeed, they might as well begin to pack their trunks now.—*Tribune, 25th.*

The Tribune either fails to see or shrinks back from openly proclaiming the root and ground of all this imbecility and disposition to compromise. The Republican pledge to "let slavery alone in the States" cripples the Government. No Administration can abide by *that pledge*, and carry on the war against the *slaveholders*. Who can help seeing it?

WEDNESDAY, 26th.

The Compromises.—Our City Dailies are getting into a wrangle about the rumors of compromises. *The World*, of Saturday, had led the way, by publishing the startling intelligence that emissaries of Jeff Davis were in Washington, in actual communication with the Government, proposing compromises &c, as our readers will find in a previous column.—*The Times* and *The Tribune* had followed, by giving calculation to similar rumors, which our readers will also see.—*This morning*, the *World* comes out with great severity against those two Journals for slandering the administration, and discrediting all those rumors, including its own!—The *Herald* 'resolves the various rumors' into a letter of Jeff. Davis, to Pres. Lincoln, proposing peace, on the ground of the impossibility of conquering the South, but saying nothing about slavery. Yet *the Herald* had, a day or two before, stated confidently that agents of the Con-Government were at work, in New York City, in favor of compromise. If it be so, *the Herald* ought to know.—The *Times* too, satirizes the alarms of its contemporaries, about compromises. The N. Y. *Sun* of this morning, takes up the case of Harvey, appointed minister to Portugal, though confidently charged with treason, and handles Weed, Seward, and Cameron without gloves, for their intimacy with Harvey, not forgetting the *N. Y. Tribune*, and the Philadelphia *North American*, of which Harvey was a paid correspondent, while also corresponding with the Charleston Mercury. The Sun adds

"Mr. Lincoln, under bad advice, has done too much for the "political suckers," connected with the partisan sheets, who have been, for years, the most active agents in Washington, of every species of corruption."

Our readers will form their own estimates of these utterances of our daily press, and whether there can be so much smoke, without some fire.

Items.—There are said to be 5,000 rebel troops near Phillippa. All the rebel forces had left Romney. The late rebel forces at Harper's Ferry turn up at Romney, 12,000 strong. All quiet to-day at Milwaukee. 'No troops at Vienna.' The government, it is said, repudiates Gen. M'Clellans' Kentucky Treaty and armstice. A convention of Democratic Editors is said to be in session at the Astor House, to-day. Prince Alfred, another son of Queen Victoria, has arrived in Canada. The rebels are intrenching themselves strongly, at Fairfax Court House. Gen. Butler is throwing up batteries opposite Hampton. The Times says, that "the fear of an immediate attack on Washington, by Gen. Beauregard appears to have again died out. The Federal Government has recognized the new government of Virginia, under Gov. Pierpont, instead of the rebel government of Mr Letcher.

The crew of the Savannah, the Confederate privateer lately captured, have arrived in New York, and committed to the Tombs. The question is mooted, What shall be done with them? Will they be hanged as pirates?

A Contraband imprisoned.—A negro boy, who says that his master lives seven miles below Acquia Creek, and was about to send him to work for the [illegible] army, was taken possession of, at the Navy Yard bridge. He says that not only are the slaves in his section of Virginia [illegible] by their masters to [illegible] rebel service, but that [illegible] negroes—[illegible] of his own knowledge—have been impressed.

He was put in prison. For what object or on what principle does not appear.

THURSDAY, 27th.

This morning's papers are unusually bare of news of general interest, except the *contradiction* of much of the sensation rumors of the previous four days as for example, Gen. McClellan's alleged treaty of neutrality with Kentucky, and the overtures of the Confederates to the Federal Government, both of which are pronounced to have been base fabrications. The Tribune's Correspondent, however, returns to the charge, in the following style:

Special Dispatch to the New-York Tribune.—Washington, Wednesday, June 26, 1861.—The Secretary of State authorizes a denial of our statement that Peace propositions have been submitted. We expected that of course. Diplomacy has the same prerogative as grand larceny, and can plead "not guilty" to the indictment. Let the Administration recall James E. Harvey from Lisbon, and break up the camps on the other side of the river, for an advance to Richmond, and the country will believe him, and discredit us. Otherwise, they will take his disclaimer for just what it is worth, and no more.

This strikes us as indecorous, not to say, insolent, in an anonymous writer, in flat contradiction to Secretary Chase, whose veracity, we believe, has never been impeached, whatever may be thought of his policy or theories. If the Tribune man has a responsible *name*, and authenticated *facts*, let them be forthcoming. If not, let him be stricken from the list of newspaper correspondents. The people want *reliable facts*. We shall not be charged with over partiality for the Administration fastened upon us by the Tribune, but we shall insist upon its having fair play.

The Times charges the Tribune with hostility to the Administration for its neglect to confer more lucrative offices, on its editors and *attaches*. The justice of this charge we shall be slow to endorse, but we think it unfortunate for the country, as well as for themselves, that the magnates of the ruling party, at such a time, should be at loggerheads with each other. Or shall we accept as applicable to them, the tart proverb that 'when rogues fall out, honest men come by their rights?'"

Some rumors of petty skirmishes are afloat, but we shal not circulate them, till confirmed.

FRIDAY, 28th.

The news manufactories, alias Dailies, of this morning, have very limited supplies of the article, of any quality. About the only one that we dare to rely upon as authentic, is the following:

Gen Banks dealt a vigorous blow at the rebels in Baltimore, yesterday, by arresting Marshal Kane, Chief of the Police force in that city. At the time of the riots which disgraced Baltimore some weeks ago, proof was not wanting that Marshal Kane had availed himself of his position to incite the mob to acts of violence; and the only subject for wonder is, that he has not before been consigned to Fort McHenry for safe keeping. That the people might not fear their rights were to be trespassed upon, Gen. Banks issued a proclamation, giving his reasons for the arrest of the Marshal. He charges him explicitly with aiding and abetting the traitors who are in arms against the government, both by direction, and indirection. Under these circumstances, he says that he cannot be regarded otherwise than as the head of an armed force hostile to its authority.—*Times.*

Of rumors, conjectures, and speculations, we have about the usual supply. The Times predicts that "the first blow of Jeff. Davis, will fall on Fort Monroe, instead of Washington. It estimates the Confederate army "in Virginia at 75,000, well armed, and undergoing such discipline as will make them excellent soldiers—for Davis, Beauregard and Lee, are soldiers, and not likely to neglect what is vital to an army's success."

Refugees from Norfolk and Richmond, report that Jeff. Davis and his satelites have instituted a perfect system of terrorism in the State, preventing all from leaving, whom they can retain, and perfectly overriding the State authorities.—*Times.*

"JOHN MINOR BOTTS is in Washington as a Member of Congress," having reached the city "under cover of a disguise." He says "the troops in Virginia, to a great extent, are busy in suppressing insurrections among the blacks. They are breaking out in every direction. Gen. Beauregard in a circular [illegible] South [illegible] and adds. 'But for this, your desire to see Washington in ruins, would long since have been gratified. If the Cotton States do not raise and equip one hundred thousand men, in six weeks, we are ruined." The Tribune gives these as among the facts stated in a letter [illegible] received from Mr. Botts himself, dated Washington city June 14.

The Convention of Democratic Editors, is said to have [illegible]

Family Miscellany.

BUT ONE PAIR OF STOCKINGS TO MEND, TO-NIGHT

An old wife sat by her bright fireside
  Swaying thoughtfully to and fro
In an ancient chair, whose cranky craw
  Told a tale of long ago;
When down by her side, on the kitchen floor,
Stood a basket of worsted balls—a score.

The good man dozed o'er the latest news,
  Till the light of his pipe went out;
And unheeded, the kitten, with cunning paws,
  Rolled and tangled the balls about;
Yet still sat the wife in the ancient chair,
Swaying to an fro, in the firelight glare.

But anon a faded tear-drop came,
  In her eye of faded blue,
Then trickled down in a furrow deep,
  Like a single drop of dew;
So deep was the channel—so silent the stream
The good man saw naught but the dimn'd eyebeam.

Yet marvelled he more that the cheerful light
  Of her eye had weary grown,
And marvelled he more at the tangled balls—
  So he said in a gentle tone,
"I have shared thy joys since our marriage vow;
Conceal not from me thy sorrow now."

Then she spoke of the time when the basket there
  Was filled to the very brim,
And now there remained of the goodly pile,
  But a single pair—for him.
Then wonder not at the dimned eyelight—
There's but one pair of stocking to mend to-night.

I can but think of the busy feet
  Whose wrappings were wont to lay
In the basket, awaiting the needle's time,
  Now wandered steps so far away
How sprightly steps to a mother's [illegible]
Unheeded fell on the careless ear.

For each empty nook in the basket old
  By the hearth there's an empty seat
And I miss the shadows from off the wall;
  And the patter of many feet,
'Tis for this that a tear gathered over my sight.
At the one pair of stockings to mend, to-night.

'Twas said that far through the forest wild,
  And over the mountains bold,
Was a land whose rivers and darkling caves
  Were gemmed with the fairest gold;
Then my first-born turned from the oaken door
And I knew the shadows were only four.

Another went forth on the foaming wave
  And diminished the basket's store
But his feet grew cold, so weary and cold
  They'll never be warm any more
And this nook in its emptiness seemeth to me
  To give forth no voice but the moan of the sea.

Two others have gone towards the setting sun
  And made them a home in its light
And fairy fingers have taken their share
  To mend by the fireside bright;
Some other baskets their garments fill,
But mine [illegible] emptier still.

Another [illegible] the dearest, the [illegible]
  Was taken [illegible] away;
And [illegible] nt [illegible]
  [illegible] l d [illegible]
Oh [illegible] at the dimmed eyelight
W[illegible] ght. *Selected.*

SONNET.

[illegible]
  If Thou the spirit give by which I pray.
  M[illegible] ren [illegible] ay
[illegible]

Of good and pious works Thou art the seed.
That quickens only where Thou say'st it may.
Unless Thou show to us Thine own true way,
No man can find it: Father, thou must lead.
Do Thou, then, breathe these thoughts into my mind
By which such virtue in me may be bred,
That in Thy holy footsteps I shall tread,
The fetters of my tongue do Thou unbind,
That I may have the power to sing of Thee,
And sound Thy praises everlastingly.

MICHAEL ANGELO.

BREAKFAST TABLE TALK.

BY REV. JOHN TODD, D. D.

On a very cold, wintry morning, the boys who had come to keep New Year's with their uncle, came down to breakfast, the moment the bell rang. It was very plain there would be no going out to play on that day; and it was just as plain that the boys had come down to breakfast with sharp appetites.

"Boys," said the uncle, when all were seated at the table, 'what were you disputing about so early this morning?—Perhaps I can help one or both of you."

"Why," said John, about twelve years of age, "we were wondering why God is so often called 'Providence.' Why should he have such a name? I said it was because he provided things, and James says that can't be the reason, because he also guards us, and yet we don't call him 'Guardence!'"

"You have both studied Latin?"

"A little, uncle."

"What does *pro video* mean?"

"It means to *see before*, does it not?'

"Yes. Now tell me how long it has taken to get this breakfast ready?"

"How long? Why, sir, it may be an hour."

"Why, it has taken thousands of years to get this breakfast ready for your eating!"

"Oh uncle! how can that be?"

"Let us see. What fish is that before you?

"Salmon, sir."

"Very well. He probably was batched up some river in Greenland, several years ago, and has been kept to grow, till he was a large fish. But it took years and years for the trees to grow, out of which the vessel was built that went to Greenland after him. That tea, which your aunt is pouring out, most likely grew at the foot of the hills in China, hundreds of miles from the ship that brought it here. That coffee, many years ago, grew in Java; a long while ago that mutton chop grew in Canada, and the sheep were driven to us here. That salt was made from the waters of the ocean at one of the West India islands. The wheat that our bread was made of, grew in Missouri. That butter was made in Vermont. That sugar in your coffee, was made in the island of Cuba. That pepper which I sprinkle on my meat, grew in Ceylon. Those cups were made in France. That tin coffee-pot had to be dug out of the mines in England. That cream is the grass and hay of our own fields turned into milk. Now, don't you see, my boys, how much time, and care, and labor, and seeing before, (*pre videre,*) it has cost to get one comfortable breakfast ready for my hungry nephews? God does all this; provides it all, brings all those things together, at the right time and the right place, and thus he is called Providence, or the Foreseer."

"But, uncle, you said it had taken thousands of years to get this breakfast ready. We can't see that?"

"What was our breakfast cooked with?"

"Cooked with! Why, with the fire, sir."

"Yes, and what was the fire made of?"

"Made of coal."

"To be sure. And that coal was made under the ground thousands of years ago, pro-vided for this very purpose. And thus God goes before us, years and ages before we are born foresees what we shall need, and gets it all ready. This is providing—foreseeing. And thus he is called Providence, the Foreseer. Do you now understand it?"

"Thank you, uncle, it is all plain now.—*S. S. Times.*

ON MYSTERY.

It has been said, where mystery begins religion ends. No sophism can be more destitute of foundation. Religion begins with mystery, nor is it possible that mystery should be excluded from it. The divine nature is, and cannot but be to us a mystery. Our own nature, compounded as it is of spiritual and corporeal faculties, is also a mystery. The whole course of nature is mystery. So is the divine government of the world, baffling continually the profoundest calculations of human wisdom.—Shall we, then, wonder if the mode of being peculiar to the 'God invisible and immortal' be beyond the grasp of our apprehension? shall we expect that while we are in this earthly tabernacle such a subject may be brought down to the level of our capacities; and that, though in almost everything else we "see through a glass darkly," we shall be permitted to "see face to face" the glories of the Almighty, and to know Him even as we are known? Surely this is to forget the distance between things finite and infinite, between heaven and earth, between matter and spirit, between things temporal and things eternal. But again, it is urged that a mystery, when revealed, should cease to be a mystery; otherwise, it is in effect no revelation. This also is a mere strife of words. A mystery is any thing hidden from human comprehension—anything imperceptible to human faculties—anything unattainable by human research. Whatever relates to the essence of the divine nature is of this description. But though the subject of the thing revealed be mysterious, the evidence by which it is made known may be such as to command our assent; and though the mystery revealed be still a mystery it may be received without any impeachment of our understandings. To a man born blind everything to him invisible is a mystery. But does he act contrary to reason in trusting to the testimony of others, respecting objects which he cannot himself discern? Though unable to walk "by sight," may he not walk "by faith?" And why may not we do the same with respect to things indiscernible or incomprehensible by our natural faculties? Faith in God is our proper guide in the one case, as faith in man is in the other. In both, though the subject be hidden from our view, enough may be known to satisfy every reasonable inquirer of its reality and truth.—*Bishop Van Mildert.*

AN INFANT LOGICIAN.

A graudchild of Dr. Emmons, when not more than six years old, came to him with a trouble weighing on her mind. "A. B. says the moon is made of green cheese, and I don't believe it." "Don't you belive it? Why not?" "I know it isn't." "But how do you know?" "Is it grandpa?" "Don't ask me that question; you must find it out for yourself." "How can I find it out?" "You must study into it.' She knew enough to resort to the first of Genesis for information, and after a truly Emmons-like search, she ran into the study:—"I've found it out—the moon is *not* made of green cheese, for the moon was made before the cows were."

DISTINGUISHED SELF-MADE MEN.

One of the best editors the Westminister *Review* could ever boast of, and one of the most brilliant writers of the passing hour, was an Aberdeen cooper. One of the editors of the London *Daily Journal* was an Elgin baker; perhaps one of the best reporters of the London *Times*, was an Edinburgh weaver, the editor of the *Witness* was a stonemason.

One of the ablest ministers in London was a Dundee blacksmith, and another was a Banfi watchmaker. The late Dr. Milne of China, was a Rhine herd boy. The principle of the London Missionary Society's College at Hong Kong, was a Huntly saddler; and one of the best missionaries that ever went to India was a Keith tailor. The leading machinist on the London and Birmingham Railroad was a Glasgow mechanic, and perhaps the very richest iron founder in England was a Moray workingman. Sir James Clark, Her Majesty's physician was a Banfi druggist. Joseph Hume was a sailor first, and then a laborer at a mortar and pestle in Montrose. These men, however, spent their leisure hours in acquiring useful knowledge.

Our readers will probably remember a number of similar enumerations of eminent "self-made men"—Franklin, Sherman, Arkwright, and so on.—It is time to understand that all truly useful men are "self-made" that is, they become wise, learned, skilful, or useful, *in some way*, by the exercise and proper employment of their faculties. Personal exertion is the great educator of all eminent men.

TO STOP BLEEDING.

Asa Kemper, Ross Co., O., writes to the *American Agriculturalist*, that bleeding from a wound on many a beast, may be stopped by a mixture of wheat flour and common salt in equal parts, bound on with a cloth.—If the bleeding be profuse, use a large quantity, say from one to three pints. It may be left on for hours, or even days, if necessary. In this manner he saved the life of a horse which was bleeding from a wounded artery, the bleeding ceased in five minutes after the application. It was left on, three days, when it worked loose, was easily removed, and the wound soon healed.

DON'T NEGLECT YOUR FARMS.

One of the great evils of war, is the scarcity of provisions, caused by a neglect of the business of the agriculturist. Farmers and farm hands should be the last to volunteer, particularly if their places cannot be supplied. If the farmers should fail to produce the great staples of life, we would have famine prices, if not cadaverous famine itself.

Secret sins are in some respect more dangerous than open sins. The more inward and secret the disease is, the more in danger of loosing his life. There are no fevers so dangerous as those that prey upon the spirits and inward parts; so there are no sins so pernicious to the souls of men as those that are most inward and secret.—Secret sins often reign in the souls of men most powerful when they are least apparent.

The Cost of Drinking to the Country.—The trial of Beauregard, who was recently hung at Montreal for the murder of another Lower Canadian, *when drunk*, cost the country four thousand dollars. It will take the duty on a great deal of wine to pay this.—*Canadian Visitor.*

"Father," said a cobblor's lad, pegging away at an old shoe, "they say that trout bite good now." "Well, well," replied the old gentleman, "you stick to your work, and they *won't bite you!*"

"Mr. Speaker," said a distinguished eccentric American statesman, "I have found the philosopher's stone: It is pay as you go!"

WRITINGS OF WILLIAM GOODELL

For sale at the office of the *Principia*: For Cash Only.

DEMOCRACY OF CHRISTIANITY, 2 Vols., $1 50..... Postage 32 cts.
SLAVERY AND ANTI-SLAVERY (History of) 1 Vol., $1 00 Postage 32 c.
AMERICAN SLAVE CODE, 1 Vol., $0 50..... Postage 16 c.

OUR NATIONAL CHARTERS

TO THE MILLIONS, INCLUDING

I. The Federal Constitution of 1787-9,
II. The Articles of Confederation, 1778.
III. The Declaration of Independence, 1776.
IV. The Articles of Association, 1774.

With notes showing their bearing on slavery, and the relative powers of the State and National Governments. Also a summary of *Legal Rules of Interpretation and Legal opinions*, collected from the highest authorities, in prefixed to the Constitution. As Appendix, contains Extracts from State Constitutions, and Bills of Rights—Ordinance of 1787, excluding slavery from the Northwest Territory; also sentiments of the Revolutionary fathers, &c.

Prices of "*Our National Charters.*"

By mail, postage prepaid, by the Publisher.		Delivered at the Office; or sent by private conveyance, or express, as ordered, at the expense of the purchaser.	
Single copy.....	15 cents.		
For 4 copies.....	50		
9 "	1.00		
12 "	1.20	Single copy	12 cents.
20 "	1.50	For 4 copies	38
31 "	3.00	9 "	75
		13 "	1.00
		20 "	1.50
		28 "	2.00
		46 "	3.00
		100 "	5.00

In packages of more than 20 or 30 copies it is generally cheaper to send by Express, (where it can be done) than by Mail. But this may depend on the distance and directness of the route, and may be ascertained by experiment, or by inquiry at the nearest Express depot.

For sale by William Goodell, or M. B. Williams, Office of the Principia, 370 Pearl St. reet, New York. Terms, Cash always in advance.

N.B. All postages on Books, Pamphlets, and Tracts, must be paid *at our Post-Office address*, so that we cannot answer orders, as above, without having received *the postage in any* as well as the price of the publication.

Also, for sale as above,

Spooner's Unconstitutionality of Slavery.

In paper covers, price 75 cents, postage 13 cts. In cloth $1.00, postage 19c.

☞ We have no books, pamphlets, or tracts for sale, except those advertised, above, and it is not convenient for us to receive orders for any others.

D. D. NICHOLSON, PRINTER, 104 WILLIAM STREET, NEW YORK.